Part Two

00:01

... new academic, hence you can make this university better than us. But you can provide a support to making sure your venue is cleaned. But the only thing you can't tolerate to say that you misuse us or use us for your own agenda. You can't tolerate that. But we want the people who can actually assist in terms of how to take this university forward. I am quite sure, I don't know, Mr, what is your surname, that is sitting at the door. That comment that I am putting forward is correct. You can't run away, but the only thing affecting my heart is that failure with this university, closed or shut down, all us, we have failed. And the big finger, the first finger we are coming to is the trade union, that the person that do not own anything in the university, we have no resources, we just come with labour and convert our labour into cash, so that we can get money for our children. Put something on the table. Can you please assist us. Make this university of sustainability to recover. And we want this bleeding no more, it is sick, we want the health. The last one I think I want to comment on is the issue of the name. Comrade, you can't, my colleague, you see 134 years, before we go there, I want to start with. NEHAWU was representing grade 1-5 For 130 years, it's ****(01:49), years. Dr Mabizela was not sitting in that particular vice. There are a number of people that are sitting in that office, ***(01:58) Govender was not sitting in that office. And I want to tell you today, you see people, whether you are criticized or not criticized, but sometimes you are ***(02:07), we see a light somewhere, somehow. When Dr Mabizela entered the office and the new Director came in, Comrade, I want to announce, we have a new recognition agreement that is a part of this transformation. And we send that recognition agreement in that grade 1-5 is no longer represented by NEHAWU but we are presented by from grade 1-17. That means there is a space for all of us. Because we are accommodated by the ***(02:39) called constitution. So, it shows very clear that the university can change. Why not change the name? You know, I know, I know, and I am not well educated but I know the assessment, I can assess somebody. The heart are bleeding. Better the heart bleeding, after bleeding, the water will come. And after the water comes, the peace of friendship worth coming together. But when the name change, we need ways how to deal with it. You can't be an issue of by night. We understood what it creates*(03:26). We need a proper consultation regarding this matter. But you must understand NEHAWU is submitting today. We need the name changed. You can't sit, if we are going into the Council Chamber. One time I see the photos of sometimes people say

intimidating these photos. But if you look today, you go there in that particular room and you'll see a big picture, good pictures that accommodate all of us in terms of the Act. Assume that if you look at that particular pictures change, that means must symbolize with the name, because the pictures change. So, Mr Chairperson, facilitator, sorry for taking your time. Thank you.

(04:28)

Thank you very much, no that is not your job. It is the job of my colleague sitting over there, to put up his hand after everybody has spoken and then close it down. You are taking over the responsibility now, that is not yours. But are you going to be one minute?

(04:48)

No, no, Chair, I want to

(04:50)

Please

(04:54)

I was waiting to be answered, because I asked a question of a burial. Because you cannot say people must go to school and then people must, must upgrade themselves, but there are burials who make that thing not happening. I asked a question that, do we look at the burials that are there, that make the people to cannot go to school.

(05:22)

Thank you my colleague, you asked a question that was not relevant to us. We are not the managers, or presenting unions, so I am sure that the persons who is on the floor can answer you. Any managers can answer you, thank you.

(05:40)

No, no, no, you are not going to put the comrade on the spot here hey, no brother. We are going to engage with this thing over lunch ne? The barriers, right, thank you very much. Give him a hand man. Okay ya of course and I actually, as the *** (06:02) come about, I don't want people to be worried about the kind of provocative and exaggerated throws of these kinds of discussions. They are like part of putting something on the table with a kind of zeal that normally comes with these processes ne? Like somebody would say, "nothing has changed". You know? It's fine. You know. We all know that some things have changed, but that point will not come across in its energy, if you say, okay, some things have changed but I want to put this thing on the table ne? So just understand how those kind of dynamics operate, it's just part of

how one deals with changing processes in any case. So, don't be too worried about these various kinds of contradictions coming to the fore, they will be part of how the report plays itself out in any case. So let governance grip, okay. Now from this clip, you are also going to hear, nothing has changed when it comes to governance.

people coming in Woah, it's a big group, the whole group is presenting. Is that true? Okay. Sure. Can I hand it over to you to manage? There are different grips here and you take this thing over here, let me scoodoodle.

(07:30)

No, no, no, just three of us.

(07: 40)

Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback from the governance group. The governance group, obviously, like all the other groups, had to identify priorities and high impact areas: the base line, and I think is the most appropriate line***(07:55) was the second point that we identified, but I do think that it is actually the starting point. And that was that we agreed that it was necessary for every member of the university, irrespective of what division the person performed a function in, that the person, that everyone had to have knowledge and information about governance and management structures, the purposes and functions of those particular structures and the links between the different structures in the university. To illustrate interdependence between the different sections. And this must be communicated clearly to everyone in the university and including on the website, which we expressed a very negative view about in its current state. And that these would, and that this information would serve as accountability maps and that would clearly identify decision making processes and reporting lines to ensure accountability. And the outcomes of this would hopefully be that people in the university have ownership of the structures in the university, that it will build trust and enhance efficiency. And we included in this, also a recommendation that there should be a sharing of the key four principles in all the structures to guide our processes. Thanks.

(09:17)

Thanks. The group that I was working with was looking at the relationship between institutional culture and governance. Professor Maylam said that his group on Institutional Cultures, this morning, encroached into all the other aspects, well we encroached into the Institutional Culture group, so. So what, I think if I can summarise the complex conversations that we had, was that there is a real need for us to foster a sense of ownership and accountability by all, in the university's shared project. It's never going to be possible for us to exactly define what that shared project is. But we need to have a strong sense that each and every one of us, regardless

of our job description, is actually, we are all working together towards a shared project. And so governance is not something that happens entirely separately from all of us in our day to day roles. We also discuss the fact that where there is a lack of participation in university structures of various kinds, including governance ones, the door is open to increased managerialism. That in fact these managerialist processes become possible where there is apathy, where there is a lack of corum, where there is a lack of people willing to step up into difficult roles. One of the practical recommendations that came out of this group was a need for all parties, and I think it echoes what you have already mentioned, a need for all parties in the university, to understand that there are in fact very many different models of governance available to us and that these emerge from different institutional cultures. And we thought it might be a useful exercise to develop a sort of simple graphic representation of the multiple types of institutional cultures and their emergent governance structures. So people can start to make sense of the structures that we have, whether those are the ones we want but also to realise that if they are the ones that we want or if we can identify the ones that we want, it has implications for how we all act in our own spaces in the university.

(11:45)

Thank you very much. Besides just having, being a shy person, I also have a cold, so please bare with me. One grouping that I have been asked to present on, one of the members of my group just disappeared, is: fitness of purpose of governance structures. Are we fit to achieve the purpose as governance structures to achieve our mandate? And the conclusion was that now, the extent at which Rhodes University is structured to achieve its academic project is not a suitable vehicle. Because if we don't know what we have, we cannot ask for anything. It's like asking, somebody said, like asking for water when you don't have a glass. So we need to go back to that statutes and do an assessment. Do we have the right schools? Do we have the resources to achieve our purpose? And we need clarity on understanding the purpose of these structures. Most people have heard about governance, they have heard about the structures but they don't really understand what the purpose of the structures are. And that there is an over democratization of structures, committees, not focused on their purpose to too large, overlapping of discussions, structures, structures and committees and working groups. We are, one of the nicknames of the university is to be a university of committees. There's a lack of ownership of individual agency, everybody just refers to the university doing this, the university is doing that yet we are supposed to be a collective and also recognising our individual agency. And we also agree that institutional rules need to be revised, there's quite, we have a lot of outdated governance rules, that Lord knows where they came from. So we came up with recommendations that there must be a clear institutional plan that is aligned with statutory requirements. The plan should be informed by and embedded in local, national and global imperatives. The plan should have clear timelines for decision making and accountability. And

discussions should be held to propose how all constituents could be represented in the structures to enhance an empathetic, inclusive organisational culture. So that to challenge the managerialists way of governance and decision making. We also need to revise institutional rules, for example to strengthen the institutional forum, to revise the composition of the institutional planning committees. Then, another area that we looked at, was we recognised that the governance structures are not just made up of a council or of a staff, the students form a very integral part of that governance and that maybe the state of chaos within our SRC is tolerated because it's easy to manage when there is chaos and there is no unity in purpose. So we look at the governance structures within the student body, where one is the SRC, the class reps, the faculty reps, the sub-wardens, student parliament, the Director of Student Affairs, we actually say what really is the role of the DSA, it's not very clear and as long as it is fuzzy, then we can look at it with rose coloured glasses. So we paid particular attention to the SRC, recognising that last year we hardly had a functional SRC, it was occupied. And we felt that we need to have an inclusive review of the constitution of the SRC. And that members of the SRC need to be vetted as potential members. We can't just have anybody represented in the SRC. And also we felt that the SRC caters inclusively for students that are in residence. I am one of those old students and some of the students here are part time and our voices are just shouted down. And those that are part time are not really represented. So we felt that the SRC needs to be reviewed so that it becomes *** (16:40) to play a role that is unifying and take cogniscents of everybody on board. The SRC needs to have a code of conduct for potential members. There is none. It is nonexistent. And the members, we can't assume that just anybody can me a member of the SRC without training. So they should be trained to understand their responsibility and be able to account. We recognised that a number of students have never received anything from the SRC and I'm one of them, I have never received anything from the SRC. So we should be should be using the email addresses that the university has given us so that all communication, even for those who are students, might be even working for government who are part time students, should be able to be contacted as members of the students. So those emails should be used. We must try and ensure higher voter participation – we are saying that the high voter participation is not happening because there is a breakdown of communication and everybody doesn't get communication. People don't know the importance of their vote – what are we voting for? We need to have consultative meetings to solicit a legitimate student voice and create such mechanisms. We all of a sudden hear that there is a Council meeting, student rep is going to be there, and we are like, wow, what is he going to talk about? We have not given him anything to talk about. So we just probably assume that they are a warm body presence in these Council meetings. We need to have transparency on SRC responsibilities. We as a student pay, we contribute to what the SRC's budget is and we need to have transparency on SRC responsibility – we need to get value for our money and is their statement audited? What is the money used for? We all have these questions. And

therefore we need to have auditor statements and all these statements must be sent to all of us so that we can begin to question the SRC based on evidence that we have. So we need mechanisms for monitoring the functionality of SRC responsibilities. Minutes of the SRC – some of us have even received it. We have a right to minutes of the SRC to be able to know what is happening and those minutes must be agreed upon that this is a true reflection of what has transpired, it must be signed and there must be a record so that in ten years time we should know the history and the functionality of the SRC. With the SRC bodies must allow for easier and better accountability. We need to bring back the SRC hall reps – somebody was saying that they don't know what happened to that. The responsibilities of SRC at Council – what do they do at Council? They don't report back what happened, they don't report back, they don't compile documentation to take to Council, they don't bring back reports to Council. And we need submission of progress reports to Council. So we are expecting actually Dr Mabizela to also question the SRC in terms of the money that they are given, in terms of how they are used, because he is the person that is responsible for that. Then there were other bodies. Okay, and then there were three, there were other bodies that were recognised, because we focused on the SRC. We need to enforce a culture of accountability and accessibility within the smaller governance committees. We need to have stricter and hold committee members accountable and review their efforts through their attempts. They should be easily dismissed as easily as they are appointed so we do not need secret ballots here. If they can get in easily, they should be able to get out quickly if they are not functioning. There should be mechanisms to ensure that faculty and class reps attend meetings around curriculum etc. with lecturers. And then the final issue is that lecturers must stay on their name. They have a tendency of polluting student movements by academic staffs/stuffs?** (20:54) They should use the forums to address student issues instead of student protest movements. So thank you, that is all.

(21:19)

Oi, yoh! What shall we do with the SRC huh? Okay and I am going to be, I am going to be fair because there was a lot spoken about the SRC, so I am going to give that whole row a chance to respond to that. So we will start there with the President, and then we end there with… perfect. Well right now, please…

(21:50)

Chair, can I please just propose that we start with the students first and then we can respond

(21: 54)

Okay, right. So the SRC, ya. Right, great stuff. Please go ahead.

(22:04)

I would really want to say that I wanted to be the last to speak because of other reasons. But I really want to say that the SRC is really working and they have improved so much from last year. However, our job, as part of student parliament, is not to pat you on the back for working, that is what you are meant to be doing. We are meant to be criticizing them and I can really say that there is an improvement. However, one thing I will say is that with the SRC, I think, they are really not out there right now, right. And there tends to be a problem whereby sometimes I think that they represent management becoming LRCs but they are actually SRCs, they are meant to be representing the students and being in our spaces. And I think that that is the most important thing that, you know, kinda, you know, ya, it's a gap, it's a problem. And I think it is something that we need to really, really, really need to focus on. And that is the only way whereby they can gain our trust. And another thing I wanted to say is that they made a comment, I'm trying to be like, um, Wits University whereby you know that the students are you know are really for the SRC. They could never really compare themselves to Wits University. Coz Wits SRC are like full of students all the way, and I do not think that they understand that. And you said one important point, sorry mama, I don't know your name, but like you said, the training is very important and I can't give much information regarding student parliament because reports haven't been released yet, but one thing I really recognise here is that training is very important. When you sit there and you just look at them, some of them they know nothing. Absolutely nothing. And it's sad, I'm sorry, guys, I'm really sorry, you are my friends but no, they know nothing. It's, ya but thank you.

(23:27)

Oh thank you, thank you very much. I, I actually like this idea, don't praise the fish when it swims.

(24:11)

Thank you very much. I just want to respond to, I think, all the points that were raised by the representatives of the group, but also just starting on the last one of training. I think there has been some clarity, the SRC does go for training. Maybe then, if the institution should be engaging with the training content, that is perhaps a concern, it could be raised that way. I'm just a bit shocked and I think we all are, a lot of the points raised by the group, seem to have been based on an assumption, which is not correct. Firstly a code of conduct for the SRC does actually exist, so that was also a bit of a surprise coming to us. Secondly, criteria or vetting of SRC candidates, this is also part of the constitution. But could we also just highlight the fact that students have an opportunity to engage with the candidates before they are elected. We have the Grazzle, we have the dining hall visits - these are all platforms available to all students to engage with the SRC, be it undergrad or postgrad. The SRC election voter turnout, I think, is more an issue with the student body itself. I think specifically, there seems to be a general blind

eye turned to student governance for the longest time. But I must say that it should be noted that I think in the last few years, the voter turnout has in fact increased. So if anything, I think that should be a positive to take from this. Student parliament is there, rightfully put to interrogate and engage with the SRC so I think that is another structure that is important to note that it's not like student leaders are elected and are just watched. Student body meetings are held and this is where student leaders get the mandate from students. We engage on a various number of issues. So I think the issue now should be maybe students who say that they do not know how to engage with the SRC and how to improve that as opposed to coming up with a whole bunch of assumptions which are incorrect. And I think that they devalue the purpose of student governance. Speaking to the issue of minutes, minutes are available on the SRC website, however they do go to student parliament first before they are published to students. So that is also another very important thing to note: there have been two sittings of student parliament, this term alone. I think the first official one this last week so the minutes will be up. So I just think that it is important that when we interrogate and speak to existing structures, that we first of all have adequate facts, that obviously improve the level of debate and engagement as opposed to the assumptions which then I guess create a situation where instead of engaging now, where it seems like it's more defensive, but the facts are wrong and they need to be corrected before the engagement does begin. Thank you.

(27:09)

I have been captured by Mr International over here. I think what has been holding us back or rather the challenge that we are facing as students, is that students aren't running for these positions, and that is what delays a lot of our processes. For instance, the hall representatives right, I was engaging one of the students yesterday after your discussion group. And she said to us that hall reps don't exist. So what we have tried to do, we have opened up nominations three times and students are just not running. I am assuming it is because they are afraid of how politics have unfolded, they are afraid to engage students. So that was the issue with the hall reps. We have opened the nominations three times right and then speaking to reporting to university Council, I think the Chairperson of Council can speak to this, I think this year only, we have started to submit reports or in fact we present the reports in Council and this is generally an overview of the situation on campus, right. So we give Council a report on what is happening on the ground, from the students perspectives, so that is done and I am sure Mr Chairman can confirm that. Oh yes and then the auditing, the budget, I'm sure Dr Lange or his office can speak to this, I'm under the impression that at the end of the year, our financial administrator collates everything we've spent and how we have spent the money, and it is submitted to their office and they are the ones that then audit it, I am not sure if it's with an external company, or ***(28:50) but that auditing process does happen, according to my knowledge. Just at the end of the year. Thank you.

(28:58)

Thank you. Okay, now that we have that out of the way, we will see where we can have some other questions answered. In fact, to be honest, the students who have spoken right throughout these three days, have actually touched on many of these kind of things in any case, and The Summit that was proposed seems to have carried a lot of support within this group and how they want to review their own work. So ya, I, er, ya. Thanks for this colleagues, so let's then have 1, 2, 3. Okay, right.

(29:40)

So the King IV was raised. The way King IV defines governance is ethical and effective leadership. And there are people in the university who are knowledgeable or are experts in the King Code of Corporate Governance and I am sure that they would be willing to give some insights to anybody that is involved in governance about the essence to demystify and simplify it so that we can actually understand what good governance means, because once we are all on the same page but in theory, we should all be working on the right direction which is to act in the best interests of this institution. Put self interests aside and focus on what is best for the institution and through that process, we can re-imagine what it is that we want to believe while we all work towards achieving it.

(30:32)

Thank you very much. There were two more hands on this side.

(30:38)

Thank you. I was part of this group and I think that things have come out which was not mentioned. We spoke at length about academic citizenship and citizenship amongst all of us as being part of a community. And I think that the whole King IV report and the need for training, I think that it pertains to all of us. I certainly know as a Dean, I would very much benefit from having a more informed training and insights into that report. And I think all of us should be humble enough to say that we don't know everything. Thank you.

(31:16)

Thanks very much. I attended the sitting of parliament which is an extended SRC. We did not have such an animal in our day at Rhodes. But I think it is a very welcome innovation. The meeting was somewhat less more poorly attended than one would have hoped. But I was highly impressed with the, particularly the orderliness of the meeting. Such meetings in our day were quite disorderly. I was also amazed that the SRC wears uniforms. Such a thing would have been unthinkable in our day. And then there was the criticism earlier, that, about the lack of

radical voices, student voices in The Summit. In our day, the SRC was very representative of the radical voices on campus, and yes, they did exist. And I wondered how the SRC responds to that criticism, whether you consider yourselves and the parliament, to be representative of the radical voices on campus. I thank you.

(32:32)

Thank you for that input. But that is a question to the SRC if I am not mistaken? (That's correct). Ya, okay. I am over here. I am going to give over to my favourite presenter. Nothing about throwing parties with **** til now, okay?

(32:54)

Okay I just want to touch on what our NEHAWU person said there about playing staff at interviews to say to them we are going to give you time to study, and then once someone is employed, all of that changes and we just leave them with work. And actually, that is true in terms of academic appointment, it's not just ***** to support staff. And I think part of the reason has to do with perhaps, maybe we are over teaching as an institution, maybe there are so many possible in our synergies and overlaps across disciplines that in that way reduce the number of courses that you teach and reach our students experience through interdisciplinary. And so at that age, it's not just your support staff matter, it is also in terms of academics. That the second thing, we have just appointed an Institutional Learning Director along those lines and I think, I hope, I don't know the brief for that office, but one of the things that we could benefit as academics and maybe take advantage of that personally presence of that person is to have a very coordinated set of gatherings that will feed to different sets of gatherings so that there are no gaps in the way we see ourselves. So I think that those are two points that I wanted to make. So one is checking the possibility of synergies across different offerings at university so that you can reduce the number of courses if we are duplicating any way, that way we reduce the need to pressurise new members of staff to over teach and therefore compromise their academic trajectory, who happen to be black by the way. Because we are transforming, we are employing black staff and so that is very important. Thank you.

(34:58)

Thank you very much. Okay, so the SRC President, oh, please go ahead.

(35:06)

Thank you very much. I think that the first thing that I would like to correct is this idea of radical students. There are no radical students, we are all students here. There are just different voices. And I think as an SRC, what is important to us, is inclusivity. It is like, in preparation for

this summit, we were given the opportunity to pretty much invite an additional ten students. And we paid a lot of attention to trying to get as many differing voices in here. So that we represent and we capture the dissenting views, the differering views, those that might not necessarily be mainstream. We take the critique, yes, we cannot always represent all voices, but in executing our duties, we do our best to capture as many of the voices as possible. So I think it would be disingenuous to say that we don't represent radical voices, we represent the voice of students and we do it quite seriously as well.

(36:04)

Thank you. I must say that I actually like this discussion because so that we don't create barriers or pockets of our one identifying cluster students in different kinds of ways. So actually a very important exchange that we have here now. But would you allow me first to come back to the group over here and then back to you?

(36:30)

I think to some extent, the lack of communication, clear communication and knowledge came out quite evidently in the responses that we have received from the SRC. I was a host of a particular ***(36:48) so I didn't move around, so I can't necessarily speak for the other discussions. But this is one of the key things that we have identified, we all need to know how the structures of the university operate. Because there is a whole lot of disinformation about what the role of a faculty board is, what the role of a department is, what the role of Senate, what the role of Council is, what the role of the SRC is, in the institution. And I think if we demystify and we clarify those lines of accountability. A guy yesterday called it them maps of accountability, which I think is a really good way of looking at them. So that we can keep ourselves accountable and we need to clarify that. And if we find that we are not fit for purpose, we can change the structures, in so far as the legislation allows us movement. But for some things, we are compelled to have the faculty board, Senate, Council and so forth.

(37:45)

I really just want to echo that, the words that kept coming up were ownership, accountability and responsibility. I think that came up in all of the groups. And I want to pick up on Di's idea of the academic citizenship, sort of our shared responsibility for that. And just to reiterate the point I made earlier, is that the moment, if we have to faculty boards for example, we have to have to have ***(38:06) faculty boards. And so if we have people in various roles within this university, who do not have a shared commitment to the academic citizenship, we will have systems imposed upon us to fill those gaps. So it really is up to all of us.

(38:27)

Thank you. Thanks very much for the feedback coming from the SRC and members of the student body. I think, if, no matter how well you do, if people don't know what you are doing, they are going to come up with something. So I think the critical issue here is communication, it does not matter how well you do, if we don't know what you are doing, then this sentiments are going to come onboard. And I think it is very fair that the SRC receives these comments with an understanding that there are these conceptions and starts working on a strategy on how to respond to this, to these. Because we really need an accounting from SRC on why some people get communication from emails because it is the most effective way of communicating, we all have email addresses. Not everybody is super good with Facebook, and all sorts of other platforms. So we need to maximize our efforts to communicate so that we have a broader reach. And then there are training of course, you may have training, but what kind of training. Is that the training that is suitable to address this kinds of problems that we are experiencing. So we might need to review the kind of training and be consultative into the particular set of skills that the SRC might need. So I think, well, that even if the issues that you are raising of code of conduct, I think we all need to, a little bit, no, and probably the summit might begin to demystify some of these issues that have been raised so that the student body may begin to say some of these sentiments that are coming up from students. Thank you.

(40:24)

Thank you very much. Can I do it this way, ne? I am going to release the group here then we go into the general discussion only for twenty minutes to half an hour. We take all the points because I think that these kind of points will probably have to reflect in the kinds of issue that are not really on the table as yet. But what we have to bear in mind is that what I heard yesterday and from the student presentation is the self-reflexive exercises that they would like to go through via an SRC summit. Where even the issue of marginal representation of different groups within our how we establish our working will be considered. Because what part of their research is showing up, is that there are student formations outside of those captured within formalized processes and how does a flexible student governance regime, make provision for those kinds of things. So there you already have some of these ideas coming through and of course, you know, it's going to be part of the recommendations and actually to my mind, would be one of the key recommendations to be taken further because it's not only this particular university struggling. Student governance in the context of student activism and differing voices as to how processes work and how they would like to organise and how they would like to associate. All those kinds of things are not necessarily capable of being formulated and articulated in the formalised regimes of participation in all the time within the university spaces. Okay, so ya. So is it okay in terms of this that I go to the next, okay? So Halev?** (42:14), I will start with you and then start with you, okay? Can I limit you to twenty minutes okay?

(42:48)

I think it's linked a little bit to the last discussion, it is a question about the democratic forms that we have in the university. And how they operate, because we rely very heavily on a particular type of committee structure, which is not always necessarily the most effective democratic form and I'm just wondering if part of this review couldn't also look at other democratic forms and how those might operate maybe better, for different types of concerns coz the committee structure tends to often be very, very slow. And so you have committees that are appointed whenever something needs to be dealt with but sometimes it can take a couple of years before a committee comes up with something, by which time people are frustrated and so on. So I am thinking if we could look at a variety of democratic forms as part of our institutional re-thinking that would give us more flexibility and more reflexivity, just as a suggestion.

(43:34)

Ya, in fact I will pick it up as part of the first recommendations as well. So in terms of the review of the governance regime at the present moment. Ok, so we will have that, thank you so much for that Halev?** With the red jacket, colleague?

(43:50)

Thank you very much. I just wanted to reflect for a moment, that there's certain systemic contracts regarding this governance of participation in that we are a relatively small university, with a relatively small component of staff. The SRC in body as it is represents a certain fixed number of people and there are a very large number of things that we need to participate in. And that creates quite a burden and I think one should reflect for a moment on the vast contribution that people make who do in fact participate and show up. Perhaps the first responsibility that one has is to in fact show up. And then claim for space. We spoke of whether that space is accommodating or perhaps exclusionary by all means. But that burden has to be shared by a very small number of people. I mean, I sit on a few of these things and it's kind of the same people I see who actually show up at most of these things. And just about the SRC in particular, I never go to these meetings and not see them there. So it's quite a considerable burden to share amongst ten or fewer people to populate the committee system of a university. And I think we need to acknowledge the contribution and the sacrifice that is being made on their part, but also amongst the staff, all staff, that you participate at and we as staff members and in all the capacities that we have, we have to acknowledge that our obligation to the institution does not stop at the class room, it does not stop in the research space, we have an obligation to contribute whatever we can to the governance process. And then if necessary to intervene in that governance process to make it more accessible to others.

(45:41)

Lovely, lovely, thank you, thank you very much. So the review both in terms of it as a regime itself and also its democratization of course can be collapsed into one particular process. Let's take at the back and then I will come to.

(45: 58)

I was part of that group and for me, one of the most important things that came out of that group was about looking at different kinds of structures as Halev*** points out. But at looking at the links between them, and what came up again and again was accountability. There was a feeling that there was a lack of accountability. So the decisions get made but where do the decisions go to and the issue came up. And the last thing is about implementation – so the problems that are seen have to do with accountability and implementation. And then what kinds of structures facilitate that kind of process in a small university. And it was recognised that because we are small, that we don't benefit in a sense from economies of scale, okay. And that is why we have the problem of the same people going into the same groups and so on and so on. But that is what has to be taken into account when we figure out what kind of structures do we need given our size, shape and place in Grahamstown.

(47:09)

So we have a great review on these terms of things. We are doing keynotes from the floor so I am very careful. Let's come to the HR Director here. And then we'll shift. I will give everyone a chance of course. Can I just remind you that this is now a general discussion as well hey. And you can clearly see that the governance issues, that was the last group, and the way in which these reviews are presented as possible recommendations in the report, is more or less at the heart of how the university is trying to re-imagine itself.

(47:52)

Thank you Chair. You have just set the preamble of what I wanted to say, because governance really is the overarching framework. And if you don't get it right, you create a dysfunctional institution. Professor Rosanne Kruger had indicated that perhaps there is a lack of understanding of the way committees work at the institution. It is my belief, I could be wrong, but I have researched it, but is that there's actually a disjuncture between the Rhodes University institution of statute and the standard institution of statuette as with by law which has made provision for the early 2000s. And that the issue is that this leads to an environment such is ours is that you have significant interpretation and incorrect application in terms of how the university should be run, in terms of the internal aspects, we are not talking about the external council and the other overarching committee structure. We do have issues around

policies at the university, in fact quite a lot of dysfunctional qualities which are kind of being reviewed. But that also gives to effect the incoherent, ineffective committee structure and in turn, creates an impasse for having a compact management structure. And so I think we need to go back to what the institutional statuette makes provision for and is there a proper application of what is entailed in provisions there. Thank you.

(49:39)

Also in support of the review. Lovely. Thanks. Next please.

(49:44)

Thank you. I am also supporting the review but I think that it is more than a lack of understanding. I think it is a fundamental lack of trust. And I think how that plays out is that it ends up that a committees decision is not accepted, and so we end up quite often creating a working group or another committee or we duplicate and we go up and down. And that is why we are talking about fitness for purpose. It is part of, I think it reflects where we are as a society in this country, and somehow we have got to get, we have got to appreciate that we are not only working in Rhodes, but we are working for Rhodes. Or whatever we are going to call this university. So that we can have that social compact and I think that is a key thing that needs to be looked at as well.

(50:29)

Okay, thank you very much. I, in fact, the very strong consensus around has been acknowledged but I want to just tie in the idea that their review is not simply a review in the context of the committee system in stream lining or rationalising, but also for democratization and transformative purposes. So that would be a key principle of a review from ***(50:57), okay? Let's go ahead, thank you. That is my colleague now, finally.

(51:06)

Thank you Chair. Our comment around the theme or the concept of sustainability. Dr Mabizela has always said that business as usual is no longer an option. And we heard here from Tony** when he presented on the facilities. Our comment on residences and other buildings, which have been awarded for over a decade, if you can judge my age, we have continually commented about food wastage. I once mentioned to Ian and he was extremely supportive, that we could turn some of that food into biomass and then we use it for cooking and it has been done at other institutions like UCT. When it comes to electricity, the department of environmental science did a study as far back as 2007 which is one of the factors resulting in the formation of environmental reps in all residences which is now part of the factors that

resulted in the formation of environmental reps in all residences, which is now part of the portfolio. Let's make full use of those students. Again you find in most residences lights are left on, heaters are left on, TVs with absolutely no homo sapien in sight. Again, if we could change the world view, we could save a lot in terms of electricity. Then, the other one, is water leakages, taps drops – I think all of us, let's go and do a sample experiment and then use that water, just turn your tap and then collect a few drops, put it in a container obviously, just time it – you don't have to be a physicist to carry out this experiment. You will be amazed at how much water we lose through simple drops and there are lots of drops. And then when it comes to environment, we have the Rhodes Environmental Committee which is well Chaired, but let's open the doors to all Rhodes constituencies. Here I mean staff and students and probably Makana so that we can help each other to change our worldviews and this will go a long way in actually doing some service. The other one is on paper. Again a colleague did a study, Professor ***(53:57) several years ago and published a paper which ***(53:41) subsidies. Let's use double sided printers and I think it is being implemented now. But that is a no brainer. Some of us still print on one side – let's use both sides.

(53:55)

It doesn't mean because you are one of my favourites that you can make a ***(53:59) of the rules.

(54:01)

And then, I am almost there Chair, and then in terms of meetings, we have heard that we have so many committees – a lot of documents are produced and it's a no brainer that some of us don't even read what is on those documents. Yet we would have wasted lots of paper in printing those minutes and so forth which people do not read. Let's think about going paperless, for those who still want to feel and smell the paper, they can request hard copies. And then when it comes to software, this is my bobby horse. When you look at statistical software, you spend thousands and thousands of dollars for these commercial software packages. Yet there are equally good, if not better packages like ***(54:53), which lucky enough, our Dean has been teaching us, what I want to emphasize here ladies and gentleman is ***(55:01) can cause a lot of indigestion, especially to all Professors and things like that. And yet we have a lot of gifted students who understand this package and we could use them and pay them an incentive from the money we save. It is a win win situation. Right so those statistical packages. Then we also have referencing software free, free, free packages. Why pay for something when you can get something equally good for free. It is a no brainer. That is the end of my contribution.

(55:37)

You can say that that was after three days of putting his hands up and making the notes. Thank you. Okay and I just want to remind us that we are now in the space of trying to capture those things that we thought has fallen off the table, somewhere along the lines over the past three days, okay? So some of the stuff has been mentioned, and you think you have a better articulation of it, resist. Ok it must be something that you think I have not been facilitated, right. Please go ahead

(56:17)

I just literally have three points. I would like any clarification in terms of the IEB for the SRC. As in terms of right now it is SRC elections and does the IEB just participate during this time of the elections, or is it throughout the year? And then secondly, I think that the training is really great and everything, however I personally suggest that, I don't think the training suits everyone. Everyone's portfolios. So I think that maybe some people who clearly, you know, need assistance, should have mentors, you know, throughout the whole year. Because I really think that each portfolio is very, very significant. And then lastly, the Vice President spoke about being very inclusive in terms of various voices and bringing out diversity, which is very interesting, however I think radical voices are very, very important, and what you will always recognise is that the most radical voices are the people who are really, really marginalised, for instance, Fees Must Fall. Those students don't wake up, or come to university to protest. They come here because they want to study and learn to get their degrees. Right. It is very important that the SRC, you know, they are the ones who are preparing and they are the ones who are leading the conversations and who are managing these protests and movements because they really, really add and give legitimacy. And they really protect and could have saved so many lives last year. When we got to the protest, we were referring to xenophobia, racism, xenophobia and these things that they could have prevented and I wish they were really recognised and carried it when ***(58:13) return the Chair.

(58:16)

Okay, can I check from the SRC side who would like to respond but can I take another student over here and can I quickly just preference the young people just for the next five minutes.

(58:31)

I would like to take from Professor over here the double sided paper, when we are printing that it must be implemented from right now by our departments. Because in my understanding, when you submitting your assignment, they do not encourage you to double side your stuff, so I think that they are listening now, they are going to encourage that and discourage the other. It will help us and also for the IEB.

(59:17)

What is the IEB quickly?

(59:19)

Okay, IEB ya...

(59:23)

Independent Electoral Board, yes. I think a lot of awareness needs to be done by this board in making sure that students understand, a lot of us do not even understand if there is such a board here. So they don't just need to show up when there is elections, they need to be there all over, making awarenesses and if, ya, thanks.

(59:49)

Can I get somebody from the SRC there to respond? Thank you very much and then I will come back here. And okay, five more minutes, okay?

(1:00:01)

Thank you. I think the point of the IEB, to that response over there, that the IEB as a board, need to take up a more active role towards elections and not just the few weeks, or when nominations open, is when they are most active. I think as student leaders, we can only do so much in encouraging people but I think as an acting board, they need to come up with strategies of getting students to want to be involved in whatever structures of governance. I think that the points raised by ***(1:00:28) need not really to respond but it is obviously stuff that should be engaged on. So I don't know if there is actually a response to it because I think they were more comments and I think that there is a need for engagement further.

(1:00:42)

Okay. Thank you very much. Both of you? Okay, no right, please do.

(01:00:52)

Thank you. One of the issues that came up in the curriculum group was that so many of us are still teaching content that we are comfortable with and that we have been using to teach for many, many years. So I would like to suggest that perhaps each of us should think about including something into the curriculum that makes the curriculum more afro centred. And that there should be a forum where this can be shared with other staff. I don't think there is enough of peer discussion amongst lecturers taking place. Partly because we all over teach. And so it is

important that heads of departments legitimize such practises and you know, create mechanisms to make it possible for a lot of people and not just the same old people to participate in an innovative process, where just one aspect of that curriculum shifts from something more north, northern based to something more southern based and more afro centred. And that we have means by which we can discuss this. The second thing is that in the last group on governance, there was a passing reference to staff who pollute student politics. I think that this is a kind of, inexplicit reference to a group called The Concerned Staff Group that was set up, self-appointedly by about 38 members of Rhodes University staff, basically in response to the interdict that was immediately placed on staff and students who have a dissenting voice around the anti-rape protests. I would like to make it clear that the concerned staff group was not interested in influencing student thinking. It was just felt that we needed a group that would not be for or against, for management, against students, etc, but a group that could act as somebody that a student could come to when they had severe issues of not having food, being in holding cells etcetera etcetera. It is important to say because I think students are quite capable of evolving, planning and implementing their own politics. I just needed to make that clarification, Chair. I also want to say that this group successfully fought the interdict and now there are only three students who are under interdict and we would like as part of the transformation process, for that interdict to be lifted. Thank you.

(1:03:37)

I want to thank one of the analysts on the governance who said that to be uncomfortable is the *** (1:03:46) This ties in directly with the issue of a protest culture, which is still not talked about and so I am raising it. There has been a protest culture led by students and there have also been staff, which was pointed out, that was involved in that. It is not as though staff are sort of being led by the students because *** (1:04:12). And those of you, Professor Bawa talk about 1985, there was an opportunity for transformation. But do you remember what we said, academics ducked and dived. And academics are very good at ducking and diving. In 2000, there was an opportunity opened from above, Professor Bawa and others were very much involved, to restructure our universities. Again, academics ducked and dived. They repackaged old courses and passed it on as new. So we are dealing with these issues and I am part of that process, who are very adept at avoiding change. And that is why there are many voices, radical voices who feel excluded from even spaces like this. So I want to ask this big question. What is the role of the university, particularly those who have power, in governance, but I also bring it down to academics, who are lecturers, you also have power, what is our role in not merely recognising protests and saying that it is in the constitution, but how do we celebrate protests? How do we develop and nurture it because there are books that have come out from Rhodes University, Chertl has granted a book on disruptive pedagogy. We are here and we can vouch for that. From Stellenbosch, an excellent book has come out about disruptive pedagogy. And

yet when it comes to the practises, the activism of disrupted of pedagogy, we want to either criminalise it or give it a kind of illegitimate status, or at best, it is bad table manners, like using your fork with your right hand. It's very respectable. So I want to really say, yesterday the SRC would like training and a more seminars like this that the radical student movement who have not even been legitimately recognised in their names. Like I was going to say the black feminists students who are the most progressive I have ever encountered. And there are others. And that they are given a space and they are funded by the university to have such seminars. And then we listen to the outcome and what do we come out with? And so we create a space, a safe space for the angry voices, for whom we don't want to have in spaces like this.

(1:06:54)

I am not going to do this. I have already identified the last speaker over here. Unless you tell me that you will like to stay until 14:00. Then we have the last speaker over here. Thank you.

(1:07:12)

Thank you. This is a very quick point. Every student here will become a power student and he or she will be an alumnus. And in our group, in the Finance and Income group here today, one of the groups was marketing, and you made a very, very, compelling delivery. I don't think there's been a chance to talk to the source of alumni as a potential source of extreme income. So really, we are appealing to the university to talk to us, to set up structures to communicate and engage more actively with alumni so we can serve the university, we can advocate resources, we can open doors. And that's at the one level. At a more particular level to not be the them and us to current students, we want to partner with you, if we can provide around any issues like books, resources, or immediate resources required in the course of your duties *** (1:08:18). But we need to have the mechanisms and the structures. So I think what I have said is the easy part, its how you do it. Thank you.

(1:08:30)

Okay. Can I ask the VC, the SRC President and the Chair of Council to come forward please. I know, I know about the hands, but I am just telling you that it is not going to work. So because I have closed the hands with this gentleman and we will know the hands at that time, okay? Because if I open it up once now, there are ten others that have to be seen too.

(1:09:05)

Before I make my brief comments, I'm sorry, I must respond to a question which was asked, "what is the university's position on disruptive pedagogy?" We support it. And we support it very strongly. Some of us who spent a lot of time reading about critical pedagogy for social

justice. I'm very much in support of disruptive pedagogy. And that is very important but we must separate, we must separate things and know exactly what we are talking about. So thank you very much Andre. I will be very brief. Let me just start my very brief comments with a familiar story. Whether it is true or not, it probably isn't true. But I think that the message behind it is quite important. And you might have heard it before. It is the story of an eagle. The eagle has the longest life span of its species. It can live up to 70 years. But to reach this age, the eagle must make a hard decision. In its 40th year, its long and flexible talons can no longer grab prey which serves as food. Its long and sharp beak becomes bent. Its old age and heavy wings due to the big feathers, sticks to the chest and makes it difficult for it to fly. And the eagle is left with only two options, die or go through a painful process of change, which lasts approximately 150 days. The process requires the eagle to fly to a mountain top and sit in its nest, there the eagle knocks its beak against the rock. Then the eagle will wait for a new beak to grow back. And then it will pluck off its talons. When its new talons grow back, the eagle will start plucking its old age feathers and after five months, it will take its famous flight of rebirth and leaves for a further 30 years. So from Friday afternoon to this morning, when we convened at this venue to hold a conversation on the issues that requires our attention. This, in my mind, has been a very productive engagement and I'm so deeply grateful to all of you for this summit. I leave with a renewed sense of hope and optimism that we will make this great university an even better university. I wish to concur with ***(1:13:08), I wish to concur with him when he said that the blaming finger should not just point away from you, but you must turn it around and point it in your direction. In short, we must all recognise our own personal agency. I know we very quickly engage in the blame game, and there is never a shortage of criticism but there are very few who come up with creative and imaginative solutions. But I must say that I have heard some very hopeful suggestions. This summit could very easily have degenerated into a blaming and whining forum. Thanks to Andre for your very capable facilitation. The President of the SRC will do the formal vote of thanks. I must concur with the Student Representative Council about the dangers of assumptions and claims, you see, for the past three days, I have had to bite my tongue into shreds as some distorted statements and gratuitous comments were made. But I resisted the temptation of responding or correcting those because it would have come across as being defensive. That was not the intention. These things do come with the territory – those who are sitting next to me could see the extent to which I was really, really, biting this tongue. I don't have one now. It is my hope that from now on, we will be using the two organising principles for our university. And that these will permeate every aspect of this great institution. One: Sustainability – environmental sustainability, financial sustainability, sustainability in teaching and learning, sustainability in research, sustainability in community engagement, sustainability in our facilities, and how we use the resources that are entrusted to our care. And we have to instil that in our students, that we have to bequeath future generations, a better world than the one that we have. The second one is about local responsiveness and global

competitiveness – that these two are not at opposite ends. That in fact, we will become a better institution when we use our locality as our departure point and enter the global knowledge arena from our position of strength. And so I am absolutely delighted with the deliberations. From my side, I was just telling some members of Council – we will get a report and Noxolo will say more about the way forward – we will get a report of the proceedings of this summit. But there are things in my mind which will be acted upon on Monday morning at eight o'clock. We do not have to wait for a report. And I think that this is important. We just can't wait for the report and I have heard some things and we will meet with the team so that we can start to implement those things which can be implemented from eight o'clock on Monday morning. And my last appeal is to all our colleagues, that we move away from this 'us' and 'them'. This is our institution. The use of management in a ***(1:18:22) sense does not advance any good cause. And standing on the side lines complaining and castigating people, will not take us a step further. If you have something to contribute, put up your hand. Thank you.

(1:18:54)

Thank you. My task is the most simple here. But before I outline the way forward, it is going to be, I want to thank you, all of you, who have participated in the discussions so far. The discussions began in February this year – this is just one event in a long line of events that has taken place. So thank you very much, to all of you. What will happen from today is that a report will be collated using the background paper, the output of the group discussions, and the input in the plannery sessions. Particularly the discussions arising from the working groups feedback. This report will be circulated to the institution stakeholders for more input and comment before a final document is prepared and submitted to the institutional forum and Council, who will decide what to do with all that rich information going forward. I want to also thank our very capable team of facilitators, one of whom has already been offered a job. I think what their facilitation skills brought to these discussions is for us to realise the possibility of having been empowered by conversations without poking each other's eyes out. And lastly I want to thank all the people who used various metaphors for this process. Various metaphors used, which I will take away with me: taming of dragons and things you cannot see, water etc. Those are very useful metaphors to help us recognise exactly what we are dealing with here. Thank you again.

(1:21:10)

singing

(1:21:36)

Amandla! Just to provide clarity on one point that was made – I think, I in no way said that we want to be like Wits SRC, we are Rhodes SRC with our own mission. In any case, university will explore you to a rich plethora of valuable life experiences and this is an experience of great

(1:22:03) to be a part of. I am profoundly grateful to be part of this brave generation of students – we are on the right track. Over and above the call for free education, we are also calling for the decolonisation of the curriculum which is underpinned by the pedagogical paradigm of Western centred thoughts and traditions. We are still calling for the education that seeks to benefit the African child and conscientise them to their own rich, beautiful history. On behalf of all students, I would like to acknowledge the hard work done by the equity and institutional culture of this and our facilitators. We have received emails with complaints and suggestions, in which I will follow up with the Director. I would like to thank all stakeholders for their contributions and participation. Importantly, I would like to thank the concerningly very few students here for their participation. This summit is a result of various student protests, various calls for the institution to transform. I say now, we conclude discussions, like ubaba Vela said from NEHAWU, after we have changed spiritually, emotionally and psychological, I say now ***(1:23:32) moving forward, from today, is decide, implement and execute. This can only be if we work together and put our differences aside. Let me be clear: We are saying that we need to achieve recommendations proposed in the summit. Once all has been consolidated, it should be our mission to ensure that the task will take years to achieve, should be achieved in months. Those that takes months to achieve, should be achieved in weeks. We need to prove to ourselves, our community and the nation, that this was not a talk shop. It cannot be that we have something similar to this in the near or distant future. We have been longing for transformation, we have been longing for change in our university. Let us work together. With that said, I would like to thank Chairman of Council and other members of Council, Chief Facilitator Prof. Andre Keets, all other facilitators in doing an exceptional job in facilitating. Senate participants, Charmaine and the catering staff, Director of Equity and Institutional Culture Noluxolo Nhlapo and her team, Ncebakasi and Babalwa. Members of student parliament, members of SRC, thank you. Again, thank you to all present. To those travelling beyond the borders of our town, we would like to say thank you and God speed and safe journey to you all as you travel to your various destinations. But do not forget that your contribution does not end here. I will end off with my favourite quote by ***(1:25:30), "We are not facing the East, nor West, we face forward", thank you.

(1:25:03)

Colleague and friends, good afternoon. I think I should start where I perhaps should have started on Friday, a place I was reminded to start and when I listened to a comment that had been made by Leroy, and that place is on safety. We have been in this beautiful facility and other facilities in the course of this weekend, and we are not briefed on safety, whether there had been any planned fire drills, and therefore we should not be worried if we hear any alarm or siren, where of course we should go out. We do of course see all the exit doors, where would we gather? How would they be accounting for people? These are things that we have got to be

alert to in the same way that Leroy and others have raised them in the context of oppidan life. There are things that we got to make sure that they form part of our life on a day to day basis. We've got to make safety a part of our consciousness and this is inclusive of small things like holding on rails when walking up or down stairs. It helps for contact. It helps minimise risk of slipping and falling and it is the small things. I believe we should also spend, give our attention to. I have to join my earlier colleagues in inviting us to give a warm round of applause to Andre Keet and his excellent team of facilitators for the great work that they have done to enable the conversations by creating an environment for us to have crucial conversations as equals. In fact in one session I went to, the first point we started off on was takeaway the sense of you are Professor so and so, Advocate X or whatever – you had to present yourselves in terms of your name and the objective was to allow all of us to start this process as equals because we will re-imagine the transforming of the institution that we want, as equals. So let's give a round of applause. We also have to extend our appreciation to Noluxolo Nhlapho and her team for all the great work that they have done – a lot of it behind the scenes, a lot of it preceding us getting here and we are most grateful for that. And I think that I should appreciate all of us here as participants. We have sacrificed a lot of things that we could have done, things that were in many ways important to all of us, in different ways, but have decided to prioritise the sustainability of this university. And for that, we all deserve a round of an applause. Clearly there can be no cause of sustainability of the university without transformation, without decolonisation. And the very conversations that we have had have been about defining or helping us define, how we get to this institution that we have envisioned as transformed. This process and the ones that will follow call upon us to re-imagine. My colleague on the group executive committee of SASO, Rian Radaman, normally advises us as follows when we deal with ***(1:30:35) decisions: Spend your imagination before you spend the money. And if so to spend our imagination here, we have been able to access ideas that in addition to not being strained by money, are more likely to bring us more income for us to drive the various initiatives and ideas that we so believe in. Our conversations have in fact echoed the following sentiment, expressed by the 18 Century social philosopher who championed the construct of a social compact, Jean-Jacques Roussouw, who said "The world of reality has its limits. The world of imagination is boundless." We have got to find a way that allows us to distribute equal value to all ideas and take none of the ideas for granted. Whether they are from a member of the support staff who cleans our facilities, or from a A-rated scientist, we have got to make sure that as a way of life, we value all ideas in order for us to move forward. When I was 27-years-old, which is many, many years ago, I had to deal with an occasion where Professor Fink Haysom, then Chief Advisor of President Nelson Mandela, and myself, had a difference on the advice to give to President Mandela, on a matter concerning medical parole one Sicilian who was in prison in South Africa for the murder of his wife. I will not bore you for the full details of this case, but must share the following: I was then the Assistant Legal Advisor for President

Mandela and Fink Haysom was at liberty to simply say that his views will prevail. And President Mandela will be favoured only with those views. He however chose that we shared with the president our differing views. President Mandela entered the elephant room of Vernandale, a name President Mandela had given to the Cape Town residence of the President and which he had obtained from one of the household support staff at Genadendale. He entered there and he went to sit in a two-seater next to Fink, across from me. That was a moment of great anxiety and self-doubt for me. Both President Mandela and Fink were tall, in fact, Fink was even taller, forget about even trying to place me in that assessment. Both of them were grey haired – I still had hair too but it was not grey. Both of them had had an association with Wits University – President Mandela having been a student there and Fink having been an academic. And I came from a small Eastern Cape university, this great university. I am most grateful to have had an opportunity to proudly call my albamata** President Mandela listened in attentively, first to Fink and then to myself. He rejected my advice and accepted Fink's, for different reasons than had been advised. It was as if he had read a publication in the 1970s by one of my academics, who was then the Dean of Law at the time I was here, Professor Schaiffer. And it is a publication entitled, "The Life of the Law Is Not Logic, It Is Experience". President Mandela's answer was far more simpler, than Fink and I had envisioned. He simply said if I follow the logical position (I presented), I would have to release many prisoners from Soweto who but for the lack of psychiatric professors and legal luminaries that the Sicilian had, would have been able to make the same case. I am relaying this because I believe that it provides all of us with crucial labels. Everyone matters in the transformation journey. While logic is critical, we should always be alert to the lived experiences of everyone and that solutions don't only lie in the submissions made by current participants. And that is the reality, too with our own process. Of course, curiously, a year later, and I had left the Presidency then, President Mandela decided to release this prisoner. In the manner it was suggested he does it and he did it very quietly on about Christmas Eve. And of course St John Paul II had weighed on him to make the decision. And there is nothing that a lowly lawyer from Rhodes University could have done to better what St John Paul II had done. The issues of social justice we can't delay, there is a solution for law, including the issue here at Rhodes of the harmonization of staff benefits that Loshnie Govender has been diligently focussing us on. And I should share another anecdote concerning my experience with President Mandela. This relates to the decision – I was this time successful in causing him to make - and it concerned what in the system of defence is called the redress of wrongs. When you have an issue or a grievance within the Defence Force, you will start off from the lowest person above you, right up to the President as Commanding Chief of the Defence Force. And in this instance, we had one lieutenant kernel Shackleton who raised a redress of wrong complaint relating to inequality and inequity in the location of medical benefits between male officers in the Defence Force and female officers in the Defence Force. The Chief of the Defence Force, the secretary of the Defence Secretariat and the Minister of Defence had all

advised. Once we appreciate this issue and the challenge that was before us, we just don't have the money to do it. And I suspect that maybe I was young then and didn't have to worry much about the budget. The emphasis that I made was that we could not prolong injustice for the purposes of the budget. And I was lucky then that President Mandela followed me that time. There is no doubt that there is a lot that we can do to improve the governance of our university and I have heard a lot being said about that and I am glad that we will also be having soon Professor Adele Moodley taking over as Registrar of the university, succeeding Dr Steve Fourie who has served the university well and diligently for more than two decades. We will work together with Professor Moodley in finding a way of crystallising the issues that have been raised around the nature, the effectiveness and the way in which we can extend democracy through our governance processes. That is an issue that we must address and indeed we must address it. Issues get raised around SRC leaders, they go to Council, we don't know what they said, what was said there, the reality is that we cannot realistically expect to have the minutes of Council placed before everyone. Exactly because of the issues that we have to deal with and the prejudice that might be suffered by others if some of that information is made available. That being said, we decided, I think about two Council meetings ago, that after every Council meeting, there has got to be a report, an account provided by Council on the decisions, on the matters that we considered and the decisions that were taken. Clearly we need to broaden that in all other areas that we are involved in, but again, I have got to make it clear to all of us, there will be certain limitations. You can't go for example and sit in recruitment or a selection panel and expect that because you hold a different view, you will take the deliberations of that committee and spread them to others. It cannot be allowed, it is not right, it will be unjust and will result in severe prejudice to the people who avail themselves for our consideration. So there are limits that we have got to factor in. Last month I was at the World Economic Forum annual meeting of the new Champions in ***(1:43:03) People's Republic of China and there was a discussion on this advent of a post-truth era and of course it is exemplified a lot by the likes of President Trump, the design of ***(1:43:23) algorithms and bots who pretend to be us and representing views, and linked to all of this were all the issues around the credibility of elected public representatives. And one Pakistani cabinet member, suggested that as politicians, when they go through elections, they have to deal with the fact that diverse constituencies with divergent interests and views, at the end, they have got to ultimately just go for the lowest common denominator. The result is that everyone feels that something about their interests have been addressed but still feel that there is something more that should have still have been done and that has not been done. And I think as we work our own transformation process, there may be some instances where we will not be able to satisfy the expectations of everyone on every point. The point of the name of the university has been raised. In many ways it is an emotive point and just because it is an emotive point, does not mean that we will not deal with it. But we have got to deal with it in a manner that takes into

account our commitment to cohesion, our commitment to envisioning a university that is better than the university that we have had. It can't be on the basis that we can smash and burn ***(1:45:22) have already gotten the things that we needed. We go off into our pastures and attain the new plans that we have set ourselves. We have got to find a way to dealing with this and you have set for us a time period. We will do our very best to comply with that time period but we will equally will have to draw from the collective wisdom of everyone on how best to resolve this. Rhodes University is not the only university in the world that has had to deal with this issue. The likes of Brown University has had to deal, an Ivy League respected university, and they found imaginative ways of resolving the issue. Brown University retained its name but still attended to the many issues of redress that had been raised. Of course, as we have done here, with reses, there have been incidents at other universities overseas, in the Ivy League, where it has been easier to change university residence names. Karen** was one of them that was done in the US and we have got to factor in all of these issues in our own discussions, in our own deliberations, but most importantly we must all be committed to emerging with a better university, a university where every member of it can take pride in, a university that can be recognised as leading. And sometimes we undermine the fact that we are a leading university, that we do produce leaders. You have to look around the world, you will find that, whether you look into the largest bank in Africa, you will find that the CEO is an old Rhodian. You can go through a whole host of other areas of human endeavour. Relative to our size we punch above our weight and we will continue to punch above our weight. Protests at Rhodes University is allowed and is encouraged. Council has a duty to ensure that protest at Rhodes University is allowed, that radical positions are advanced. But of course we don't believe that there is anything progressive and radical about simply insulting others, harassing them and engaging in all other acts of criminal conduct which are known and accepted in society and we will never tolerate them in our own homes and in our communities. They will not be tolerated at Rhodes University. That does not in any way detract from our commitment to create a space that enables radical engagement, robust engagements that will lead us and must lead us to this transformed university that we seek. But there are certain things for which there are limits. And some of the things that we have done before, we can't encourage. We can't create an environment that enables them. But that does not excuse us from not dealing with the issues that we are confronted around with transformation and we will. In closing, I think that I should share a quote that I believe very much in, attributed to John Maysfield, which he made addressing a gathering of the University of Sheffield, and he said: "There are a few earthly things more beautiful than a university. It is a place where those who hate ignorance, may strive to know, where those who perceive truth, may strive to make others see, where teachers and learners alike, who rally together in search for knowledge, will honour thought in all its fine ways, who will welcome thinkers in distress or in exile, will uphold ever the dignity of thought and learning and will exert** standards in these things." Thank you.

(1/;51:07)

The Vice Chancellor has given me an added privilege that I declare this summit closed. And I think we have lunch outside. Thank you very much.